7 Taiharuru

Description and geomorphology

Taiharuru Bay is located on the east coast of Northland, approximately 19 km east of Whangarei.

The site is an east facing pocket beach embayment situated between the two headlands of Waipuna Point in the north and Huitau Point in the south. Both headlands comprise of Greywacke rock.

The relatively low lying central dune area is approximately 190 m long and is developed with the most seaward dwelling located 8 m from the dune toe.

The site has a mixed coarse sand and gravel beach, with a high portion of pebble material above the high tide line. The central section of the beach has a 20 m wide berm above the high tide line. The site has no high tide berm at both the northern and southern cliff end sections of the bay.

The central beach section has a typical profile that transitions from a grass bank down to the berm with a revetment that is approximately 2 m high. The backshore elevation ranges from RL 4 m to 5 m.

Local considerations

There is a rock revetment located along the 190 m long central section of the site. A boat ramp is situated at the southern end of the revetment.

The topography rises up to a headland on either side of the central beach area. The southern cliff consists of highly weathered Greywacke, with an actively eroding cliff face. The cliff elevation at this ranges from 17 to 23 m. The northern cliff shoreline is moderately strong Greywacke with an elevation of approximately 18 to 30 m.

Coastal Erosion Hazard Assessment

The site is split into three cells based on differences in geomorphology, exposure and cliff/dune height.

Adopted component values are presented within Table 7-1. While the cliffs at either end are both relatively high (18-30 m), the rock at the



Site Photograph A (North cliff shoreline)



Site Photograph B (centre)



Site Photograph C (south cliff shoreline)

southern end is more highly weathered and so has a low stable angle of repose. Both cliffs are retreating at rates up to 0.2 m/year. Histograms of individual components and resultant CEHZ distances using a Monte Carlo technique are shown in Figure 7-2. Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone widths are presented within Table 7-2 to 7-4 and Figure 7-4.

Future shoreline distances range from 8 to 9 m for cliffs to 2080 with CEHZ1 of 28 m for the beach cell. 2130 shoreline distances range from 24 to 34 m for cliffs, CEHZ2 and CEHZ3 for the beach cell are 58 and 70 m respectively. The CEHZ's have been mapped in agreement with the calculated values

For cell 7A and cell 7C the cliff projection method has been adopted with future shoreline distances shown in Figure 7-1, Figure 7-3, Table 7-3 and 7-4 instead of CEHZ distances.

Figure 7-5 shows the available historic shorelines for Taiharuru.

Site			7. Taiharuru		
Cell		7A ¹	7B ²	7C ¹	
Cell centre	E	1740449	1740368	1740482	
(NZTM)	N	6045171	6044960	6044787	
Chainage, m (from	n N/W)	0-500	500-700	700-1000	
Morphology		Greywacke	Dune	Greywacke	
	Min	0	5	0	
Short-term (m)	Mode	0	10	0	
	Max	0	15	0	
Dune/Cliff	Min	18.0	4.3	17.0	
elevation (m above toe or	Mode	23.5	5.3	19.2	
scarp)	Max	29.9	5.8	22.9	
	Min	26.6	30	14	
Stable angle (deg)	Mode	30.2	32	16.2	
(ucg)	Max	33.7	34	18.4	
Long-term (m)	Min	-0.05	0	-0.05	
-ve erosion	Mode	-0.1	-0.05	-0.1	
+ve accretion	Max	-0.15	-0.15	-0.2	
	Min	0.5	0.038	0.75	
Closure slope (beaches)	Mode	0.25	0.028	0.5	
()	Max	n 0 ode 0 ox 0 n 18.0 ode 23.5 ox 29.9 n 26.6 ode 30.2 ox 33.7 n -0.05 ode -0.1 ox -0.15 ode -0.25 ox -0.15 ode -0.25 ox -0.16 ox -0.16 p8.5M 0.23 p8.5M+ 0.21 p2.6 0.28 p4.5 0.42 p8.5M 0.42	0.024	0.25	
	RCP 2.6	0.16	0.16	0.16	
SLR 2080 (m)	RCP 4.5	0.21	0.21	0.21	
SLR 2080 (m)	RCP 8.5M	0.33	0.33	0.33	
	RCP 8.5H+	0.51	0.51	0.51	
	RCP 2.6	0.28	0.28	0.28	
CLD 2120 (m)	RCP 4.5	0.42	0.42	0.42	
SLR 2130 (m)	RCP 8.5M	0.85	0.85	0.85	
	RCP 8.5H+	1.17	1.17	1.17	

Table 7-1 Component values for Erosion Hazard Assessment

¹Cliff projection method has been used, so distance to future cliff toe position has been tabulated. Actual CEHZ width will be greater depending on cliff height and stable slope angle.

²CEHZ0 included behind coastal protection structure



Figure 7-1 Histograms of parameter samples and the resultant shoreline distances for 2020, 2080 and 2130 timeframes for cell 7A



Figure 7-2 Histograms of parameter samples and the resultant shoreline distances for 2020, 2080 and 2130 timeframes for cell 7B



Figure 7-3 Histograms of parameter samples and the resultant shoreline distances for 2020, 2080 and 2130 timeframes for cell 7C

66

	Site		7. Taiharuru						
		A*	В	С*					
	Min	0	-9	0					
	99%	0	-10	0					
	95%	0	-11	0					
nce	90%	0	-11	0					
Probability of CEHZ (m) Exceedance	80%	0	-12	0					
xce	70%	0	-13	0					
u) E	66%	0	-13	0					
IZ (r	60%	0	-14	0					
E	50%	0	-14	0					
, of	40%	0	-15	0					
ility	33%	0	-15	0					
bab	30%	0	-15	0					
Pro	20%	0	-16	0					
	10%	0	-17	0					
	5%	0	-18	0					
	1%	0	-18	0					
	Max	0	-20	0					

Table 7-2 Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone Widths for 2020

*Cliff projection method has been used, so cliff toe position has been tabulated, which has been assumed to be unchanged from the adopted 2019 baseline. Actual CEHZ width will be greater depending on cliff height and stable slope angle.

Site		7. Taiharuru											
Cell	7A					7B				7C			
RCP scenario		2.6	4.6	8.5	8.5+	2.6	4.6	8.5	8.5+	2.6	4.6	8.5	8.5+
	Min	-3	-4	-4	-4	-15	-16	-20	-25	-3	-4	-4	-4
	99%	-4	-4	-5	-5	-17	-19	-22	-28	-4	-4	-5	-6
	95%	-5	-5	-6	-6	-19	-21	-24	-30	-5	-5	-6	-7
e	90%	-5	-5	-6	-7	-20	-22	-25	-31	-5	-6	-7	-8
anc	80%	-6	-6	-7	-8	-21	-23	-27	-32	-6	-7	-8	-9
edi	70%	-6	-7	-8	-9	-22	-24	-28	-34	-7	-7	-8	-10
XCe	66%	-6	-7	-8	-9	-22	-24	-28	-34	-7	-8	-9	-10
ת ד	60%	-7	-7	-8	-9	-23	-24	-28	-34	-7	-8	-9	-10
ı) z	50%	-7	-7	-9	-10	-23	-25	-29	-35	-8	-9	-10	-11
CEH	40%	-7	-8	-9	-10	-24	-26	-30	-36	-8	-9	-11	-12
of	33%	-8	-8	-9	-11	-25	-27	-31	-37	-9	-10	-11	-13
lity	30%	-8	-8	-10	-11	-25	-27	-31	-37	-9	-10	-11	-13
abi	20%	-8	-9	-10	-12	-26	-28	-32	-38	-10	-11	-12	-14
Probability of CEHZ (m) Exceedance	10%	-9	-10	-11	-13	-27	-29	-33	-40	-11	-12	-14	-16
<u>م</u>	5%	-9	-10	-12	-13	-28	-30	-34	-41	-12	-13	-15	-17
	1%	-10	-11	-13	-15	-30	-32	-36	-43	-13	-14	-16	-19
	Max	-10	-12	-14	-16	-34	-36	-41	-48	-14	-15	-18	-21
	CEHZ1 -8*					-28				-9*			

Table 7-3 Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone Widths Projected for 2080

*Cliff projection method has been used, so distance to future cliff toe position has been tabulated. Actual CEHZ width will be greater depending on cliff height and stable slope angle.

Site		7. Taiharuru												
Cell				7A		7B 7C								
RCP	RCP scenario 2.6 4.6 8.5 8.5+				8.5+	2.6	4.6	8.5	8.5+	2.6	4.6	8.5	8.5+	
	Min	-6	-7	-8	-9	-19	-23	-36	-45	-6	-7	-8	-8	
	99%	-7	-8	-10	-11	-22	-27	-39	-49	-7	-8	-10	-11	
	95%	-8	-9	-11	-12	-25	-29	-42	-52	-9	-10	-12	-13	
	90%	-9	-10	-12	-14	-26	-30	-44	-54	-9	-11	-13	-15	
JCe	80%	-10	-11	-14	-15	-27	-32	-46	-56	-11	-12	-15	-17	
dan	70%	-11	-12	-15	-17	-28	-33	-47	-58	-12	-14	-17	-18	
cee	66%	-11	-13	-16	-17	-29	-34	-48	-58	-12	-14	-17	-19	
CEHZ (m) Exceedance	60%	-12	-13	-16	-18	-30	-34	-49	-59	-13	-15	-18	-20	
<u>E</u>	50%	-12	-14	-17	-19	-31	-35	-50	-61	-14	-16	-20	-22	
EHZ	40%	-13	-15	-18	-20	-32	-36	-51	-62	-15	-17	-21	-23	
of CI	33%	-14	-15	-19	-21	-33	-37	-52	-63	-16	-18	-23	-25	
ţ	30%	-14	-16	-19	-21	-33	-38	-52	-64	-17	-19	-23	-25	
bili	20%	-15	-17	-21	-23	-34	-39	-54	-65	-18	-20	-25	-28	
Probability	10%	-16	-18	-22	-25	-36	-41	-56	-68	-20	-23	-28	-31	
Pr	5%	-17	-19	-24	-26	-38	-43	-58	-70	-22	-24	-30	-34	
	1%	-18	-20	-26	-29	-40	-45	-61	-74	-23	-27	-34	-38	
	Max	-19	-22	-29	-33	-45	-51	-68	-81	-25	-29	-38	-43	
	CEHZ2		-24*			-58*				-30*				
	CEHZ3		-26*				-70*				-34*			

Table 7-4 Coastal Erosion Hazard Zone Widths Projected for 2130



